

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claim 29 is allowed.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-29 are pending in this application. Claims 10-16 and 26-28 have been canceled by this reply. Thus, of the remaining claims, claims 1, 17, and 29 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1 and 17.

Drawings

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to accept the drawings filed on November 12, 2004.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 8-12, 17-19, and 24-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6635089 (“Burkett”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6615223 (“Shih”). Claims 10-12 and 26-28 have been canceled by this reply. Thus, this rejection is now moot with respect to the canceled claims. With respect to the remaining claims, claims 1 and 17 have been amended to include the subject matter indicated as allowable on page 13 of the Office Action mailed March 25, 2005. Specifically, independent claims 1 and 17 have been amended to include the allowed subject matter of independent claim 29 (*i.e.*, limitations H, I, and J of claim 29). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that no new search or consideration is required by these amendments. Thus, independent claims 1 and 17 are now patentable over Burkett and Shih, whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claims 2-3, 8-9,

18-19, and 24-25 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 4 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burkett in view of Shih and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6480865 (“Lee”). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As noted above, independent claims 1 and 17 have been amended to include allowed subject matter from independent claim 29. Thus, independent claims 1 and 17 are patentable over Burkett, Shih, and Lee, whether considered separately or in combination. Further, dependent claims 4 and 20 are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5-7 and 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burkett in view of Shih and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6609121 (“Ambrosini”). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As noted above, independent claims 1 and 17 have been amended to include allowed subject matter from independent claim 29. Thus, independent claims 1 and 17 are patentable over Burkett, Shih, and Ambrosini, whether considered separately or in combination. Further, dependent claims 5-7 and 21-23 are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 13, 15, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burkett. As mentioned above, claims 13, 15, and 16 have been canceled by this reply. Thus, this rejection is now moot.

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burkett in view of Lee. As mentioned above, claim 14 has been canceled by this reply. Thus, this rejection is now moot.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 03226/541001).

Dated: May 25, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Robert P. Lord

Registration No.: 46,479

OSHA · LIANG LLP

1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800

Houston, Texas 77010

(713) 228-8600

(713) 228-8778 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant

100041_1.DOC